

The COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Vol. VII. No. 6.

Workers' Library Publishers,
35 East 125th St., New York.

FIVE CENTS.

CONTENTS

	Page
On the Broad Road to Winning the Masses	61
The United Front of Mr. Brandler	66
The "League for Liberation of the Ukraine." By N. Skrypniuk	71
6th March and our Immediate Tasks in the Struggle for the Majority of the Working Class. By B.V.	83
The International Communist Press and March 6th	87

On the Broad Road to Winning the Masses

THE FORTHCOMING FIFTH CONGRESS OF THE R.I.L.U.

THE preparations for the Fifth Congress of the R.I.L.U., which will take place in July, constitute one of the most important tasks confronting all sections of the Comintern. The questions on the agenda of the Congress are far from being "merely trade union" questions. If it is true—and it is assuredly true—that politics is the science and art of leading millions, then trade union policy is one of the most essential parts of this

science and art. The standard of bolshevik maturity, the degree of the mass influence of the majority of Communist Parties, can to a large extent be measured by the success they have achieved in winning over the workers organised in trade unions to the ideas of communism. This is not invalidated by any attempt to evade the problem of winning the trade union masses, attempts supported by declarations that "the members of trade unions consist mainly of highly skilled workers, and a highly skilled worker is the most typical labour aristocrat." Such declarations have recently been made by some comrades, who arrive at conclusions in too easy a fashion.

ABOUT ten years ago, in greeting the inaugural Congress of the R.I.L.U., Comrade Lenin wrote:—

"The winning over of trade union members to the ideas of communism is everywhere proceeding irresistibly; in every country, in the whole world; progress may be slow and uneven, having to encounter a thousand and one obstacles, but it is irresistible."

Side by side with this central task, there is the equally important task of winning over the unorganised masses of workers, particularly in those countries where the unorganised form the overwhelming majority of the working class (the U.S.A., etc.).

In the ten years of its work to revolutionise the masses, the R.I.L.U. has become an extremely powerful instrument for winning over organised and unorganised workers. Thanks to the work of the R.I.L.U., great numbers of organised workers have been won over to

the ideas of communism, while large sections of the working class, untouched by the reformist trade union movement, have been aroused and stirred to take part in the organised fight against the capitalist system. As a result of this decade of work, large parts of the earth—particularly the Far East—have been drawn into the revolutionary trade union movement.

THE suppressed proletarian masses of America and a number of European countries, who were deliberately ignored by the bureaucrats of the reformist trade unions, have found in the R.I.L.U. the organiser of their struggle. The struggle between Moscow and Amsterdam has become one of the most important factors in the great fight which the revolutionary communist section of the working class movement is waging, with the object of isolating from the masses and breaking down the reformist social-democratic movement, which is rapidly becoming social-fascist. To fight for the working masses organised in trade unions, to organise them in a united front with the unorganised for independent struggle—this is the most important task in winning over the decisive sections and the majority of the working class. This work is proceeding spasmodically, at times incorrectly. Events which, ten years ago, induced Lenin to answer with an emphatic "yes" the question: "Should communists work in reactionary trade unions?" are being repeated to-day. Still more frequently we can observe examples of trade union legalism, barring the advance of communists along the high road of winning the working masses in the trade unions, examples of conservative adherence to the old methods and forms of communist trade union work which, in time, develops into capitulation to the trade union officialdom and leads to actual desertion. The renegades' policy of surrender—confusing elasticity and flexibility in trade union work with spinelessness—is the greatest danger for the Communist Parties in the sphere of trade union work.

THE two deviations—right and left—from Leninist trade union tactics, which are the cause of incorrect, unsystematic and hesitating methods of struggle to win over the

workers organised in trade unions, have one essential feature in common. The renegades who consider themselves to be "specialists in trade union work" understand just as little as the left sectarians the art of Lenin's trade union policy—to utilise to the utmost the possibilities of work in reactionary trade unions, to remain in those unions until such possibilities have been fully utilised, without being bound by the limits prescribed by the social-fascist trade union bureaucrats.

The great service rendered by the Profintern in the ten years of its existence has been to give greater precision and clarity to the methods and forms of revolutionary trade union work, thus eliminating many—though far from all—factors leading to incorrect and unsystematic communist work in the trade unions.

The First Congress of the R.I.L.U. was attended by such trade union leaders as D'Aragona and by syndicalist elements for whom "Bolshevism is not revolutionary enough" and who, like D'Aragona, have fallen into the mire of fascism and counter-revolution. But even in the disharmony of confused and varied opinions and convictions which was apparent at that Congress, we were successful in establishing an organisational centre, which later became the centre for independent revolutionary trade unions and mass revolutionary trade union oppositions, in the reformist unions. Everything that was said at the Congress about the Amsterdam International has since been fully justified. The Amsterdam trade union bureaucracy, the prop of the imperialist League of Nations, the instrument of the imperialist bourgeoisie for strangling the revolutionary movement of the working class, has become the vanguard of social fascism within the working class.

THE Second Congress was still concerned with questions of principle, in the first place with the problem of "the Party in the trade unions," the dictatorship of the proletariat versus syndicalist utopias. Bolshevism won at the Second Congress. The best among the ranks of the syndicalists—true, after some hesitation—came over to the side of communism. Those who did not do so have now, despite all their revolutionary

phraseology, either found their way into the camp of the Amsterdam International or are very close to it.

The Third Congress, which met in the period of "democratic pacifism," in the early stages of the partial stabilisation of capitalism, gave evidence of a broadly developed attempt to save the unity of the trade union movement from the Amsterdam disruptors. Everything consistent with revolutionary trade union policy was done in order to mobilise the international proletariat for united resistance against the attacks of capitalism. Without any illusions, the communists fought for the unity of the world trade union movement in the interests of the whole working class. The Amsterdam International, on the other hand, took the road of fascism, in order to put brakes even on the defensive struggle of the working class against the attacks of international capitals. Such renegades as the Brandlerites, Walcherites and others, preachers of "unity at any price," were anxious that the Profintern should establish the unity of the trade union movement, not *against* the leaders of the Amsterdam International, but simply as a surrender to them.

The close of the period between the Third and Fourth Congress of the R.I.L.U. saw the beginning of the breakdown of capitalism's relative stabilisation. The radicalisation of the working class proceeded, it is true, gradually, but every day brought forth new signs proving clearly that, with the advance of the working class, new methods of trade union work, among both the organised and the unorganised, were an urgent necessity. The old methods of manœuvring had necessarily become the methods of those who cling obstinately to a policy of "nursing" the social democrats, of surrendering to the trade union bureaucracy. With the fact of the social-fascist development of the reformist trade unions, every attempt to win from below the central or middle trade union machinery was nothing but an injurious opportunist illusion. The struggle in the factories, involving the unorganised, the more precise and definite stand for leadership made by the trade union opposition, the independent, organised leadership of the workers in their daily struggles, independently of the trade union

bureaucrats and against their will—these were the urgent questions facing the Fourth Congress.

THE Fourth Congress discussed and decided these problems; the independent leadership of working class struggles, the united front with the unorganised masses who hold back from the trade unions because of the social-fascist policy of the leaders, independent activity in factory committee elections. The Congress either solved these problems or provided the key for their solution in the future. Not all the decisions taken at the Congress have been put into operation in the two years which followed. There has been far too much opportunist vacillation in our ranks, which has prevented us from putting into practice in our day-to-day work the decisions of the Fourth Congress. Now, however, it is true to say that the organisation of the revolutionary trade union opposition, the independent militant leadership of the daily struggles of the working class, the fight to win the factory committees by independent revolutionary methods, are all advancing irresistibly. The obstacles, to which Lenin referred ten years ago, which stand in the way of our winning over the trade unionist masses to communism, have not yet all been surmounted, but many of them have certainly now been overcome. The fact that, in the conditions of the third period of the post-war capitalist crisis, every economic struggle encounters the united front of the capitalists and social-fascists, opens the eyes of the workers who were formerly blinded by reformism. The question of the close relation between economic and political struggles necessarily arose as economic struggles were transformed into political ones.

It is the task of the revolutionary trade union movement to bring this fact home clearly to the consciousness of the trade union masses. This work has not yet reached a satisfactory standard. Many of the problems involved have been overlooked by the sections of the Profintern. Relics of the old opportunist attitude, as well as passive sectarianism, have greatly hindered the growth of the mass influence of the red trade unions and trade union oppositions. The names of Hais and

Walcher have become symbols of opportunism, obstacles in the way of the growth of the mass influence of the red trade unions and revolutionary trade union oppositions in the reformist organisations. Some opinions recently expressed in Czecho-Slovakia (for example, that red trade unions should of course throw skilled workers overboard, as labour aristocrats) showed that the desire to evade, rather than fight, the difficulties which arise in carrying on the struggle for the majority, the decisive sections of the working class, still exists.

AT the Fifth Congress of the R.I.L.U. we shall have to conduct a struggle on two fronts.

First of all, we shall have to fight against the chief danger—opportunism in trade union policy, which still has deep roots among a number of trade union workers. Fear of the masses, evasion of the struggle, is expressed in various forms, wholly in opposition to the Leninist trade union policy. At the present time, while we direct our chief attack against the right—against right wing capitulation—it is important to achieve complete clarity on the practical question of winning the masses of trade unionists. The Fifth Congress is confronted with a very important question: How, with the present radicalisation of the working class, with the ripening of revolutionary factors in general, and the ripening of actual revolutionary situations in some countries, can we organise the united front of the trade unionists with the unorganised masses, so that every struggle of the working class may become a political struggle, a political mass strike?

Every expression of narrow dogmatism in this "transitional period," when the elements of a revolutionary situation are maturing, but have not yet come to a head in the majority of countries, every example of passivity and complacent assurance that the panacea has been found for reformism and social-fascism, serves but as an obstacle to the Leninist solution of the problems which confront the Fifth Congress.

There are a number of practical lessons, on the basis of which we can approach the solution to these problems. In the first place, we

must utilise the experience of the German trade union opposition in order to discover the way of getting the organised and unorganised masses into the revolutionary trade union opposition. It would, however, be incorrect to assume that the application of only organisational forms, without the application and improvement of the methods of mass trade union work and the real operation of the line already laid down, will lead to the growth of communist mass influence. The methods of rallying the workers, both organised and unorganised, cannot be limited to a single method, to forms or slogans given "once for all." At the present time particularly, with the advance of the revolutionary wave, it is impossible to bind ourselves down to any rigid forms of mass work, prescribed for all countries and all future stages of development. This advance demands that the slogans of the day-to-day struggle should have both a mobilising and an organising force.

The inclusion of factory committees and of unorganised workers in the German trade union opposition was a great step forward, pointing out the road for the development of trade union oppositions in other countries and for the growth and strengthening of the influence of red trade unions.

THE Fifth Congress of the Profintern is confronted with the task of strengthening and concentrating the revolutionary trade union opposition (in Germany, Austria, Sweden, etc.), and also with the practical work of indicating the ways of organising the masses, in the conditions of the revolutionary wave, in countries with an independent revolutionary trade union movement (France, Czecho-Slovakia, U.S.A., etc.). We can no longer endure a situation in which the opportunists (Hais and Co.) with impunity conduct work hostile to the line of the R.I.L.U. inside the red trade unions. We can no longer endure a situation in which the French C.G.T.U., despite the growth of its political influence, has been unable to increase its membership. The Fifth Congress must be the starting-point for a definite change in mass work, both in revolutionary oppositions and in independent red trade unions.

The establishment of revolutionary trade unions and their growth in France, the U.S.A., Latin America and the majority of colonial countries demonstrates clearly that communists do not limit their activities by any rigid views about organisational forms. No Leninist considers it necessary to establish new trade unions "just for the sake of a split," but no communist can declare—as Brandler, Walcher and Co. do—that the establishment of revolutionary trade unions is a violation of unity, once there is no longer any possibility of carrying on revolutionary mass work in the reformist unions, which turn to fascism. It would be a crime to leave those reformist trade unions, in which thousands of workers are still organised, thereby neglecting important fields of struggle. The organisation of a revolutionary trade union opposition considerably facilitates the organisation of resistance to the sectarian policy of the trade union bureaucracy and helps to develop the organisation of the united struggle of organised and unorganised workers. But it would be no less a crime—particularly now, when revolutionary developments demand the organisation of *subjective* factors, when, with the development of the world economic crisis, the victory of the revolution depends in the first place upon the organisation of the communist vanguard in the revolutionary movement—to leave the working class wholly to the mercy of the trade union bureaucrats. The independent leadership of the struggle requires the utmost possible strengthening and development of work in the factories, among the organised and unorganised. The organisation of revolutionary work in the factories should always be in a state of militant readiness, in order to be able to take full advantage of every possibility of struggle to improve the position of the working class against capitalism and fascism, and to strengthen the revolutionary organisations.

THE Fifth Congress must give a clear answer to all these important questions, on the basis of a thorough analysis of the experience of the workers in different countries and in different branches of industry, during the period of struggle which has passed since the Fourth Congress of the R.I.L.U. and the Sixth Congress of the Comintern. Prepara-

tion for the Fifth Congress, in every section of the Communist International, in all the organisations of the R.I.L.U., in every trade union opposition, factory and factory committee, must consist in the first place of a precise evaluation of past experience. The task of every leading central body—both in Party and trade union work—must be to study this experience carefully and to weigh and select those experiences in local struggles which can be of value on a national scale, those methods of struggle, which arise spontaneously from the ranks of the workers themselves, which can serve as guiding threads in the organisation of the struggle on a broad, international scale. The task of the Fifth Congress is to collate and summarise all these experiences, to give a common international synthesis to all the lessons of the struggle, and to indicate its application in accordance with the requirements of the different countries and the different conditions of struggle.

The Communist Parties must exert their forces to the utmost for the purpose of carrying out the plan of preparatory work which was drawn up at the last enlarged presidium of the E.C.C.I. A careful review must be made of the carrying out of the decisions of the Fourth Congress of the Profintern, particularly in the sphere of the independent leadership of the economic struggle. The work of the Party fractions in the trade unions must be thoroughly examined, all weaknesses and mistakes indicated and exposed, and a vigorous struggle conducted against trade union legalism and right wing opportunism on the one hand, and against left sectarianism on the other.

If this work is to be properly carried out, it is essential that this most important preparatory work should be taken in hand by the central organs of the Communist Parties. It has already become a feature common to all Communist Parties—and herein lies one great service rendered by the Profintern—that trade union work is not merely a departmental affair, and that the leadership of the economic struggle is recognised as a supremely important political task of the Communist Party.

All the problems of the Fifth Congress must be discussed on the widest possible

scale. Then, on the basis of this broad, collective preparatory work, the Fifth Congress will be enabled to find the essential link on which we must keep firm hold, to find the basis, the backbone as it were, of its work, to put forward correctly, and to answer correctly, the most important questions facing the revolutionary trade union movement. Then Communist trade union work will proceed firmly along the broad road to a mass movement.

The United Front of Mr. Brandler

AT a time when the preparation for armed intervention against the U.S.S.R. has been intensified, when the Pope has declared a crusade against the U.S.S.R., and when to the sound of church-bells the religious and the non-religious enemies of the working class have everywhere offered prayers "to save the souls of the beloved Russian people," this Christian choir has been augmented by the squeaky voice of a small sect—the Brandlerites.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in keeping with the declared crusade, proposed that his Government should send a message to the Soviet authorities suggesting that, for the well-being of the spiritual life of the Soviet Republic, the following small reforms should be carried out: Restore the franchise to the priests, restore and guarantee the inviolability of church property and prohibit the propaganda of the atheists.

The sect of Brandlerites in Chemnitz, in keeping with the same crusade against the U.S.S.R. and the Comintern, has sent an analogous message to the Executive of the Comintern (published in No. II. of the special supplement to the *Gegen den Strom*), suggesting that they should, for the well-being of the Comintern, re-admit all the expelled renegades, immediately open an international discussion for the drawing up of a new Comintern policy (naturally, in the spirit of these renegades), re-elect all Party leaderships and functionaries, including the E.C.C.I. (replacing it, of course, by the renegades), appoint an impartial enquiry into "corruption" in the

Comintern, and, finally, "compel the Parties to obtain the necessary funds from membership contributions only"—(a provocative hint *re* "Moscow gold"!)

The impudence of this message which is, in fact, a proposal for the dissolution of the Comintern, can only be compared with the political cowardice with which the general line of Brandlerism has always been expressed. On reading this message from an insignificant handful of renegades, one cannot help calling to mind the words from Krylor's fable: "Fido is so strong, he can bark at an elephant." But the Brandlerite Fidos in this case are not even barking on their own initiative. They are doing it by order. These renegades, who cannot leave off talking about the "united front," have in this instance brought about a united front with the social-fascists and are actually carrying out their instructions. That people calling themselves communists should send an open letter to the Comintern in which they proclaim that the Comintern is already at its last gasp, and has reached such a degree of impotence that even a handful of renegades could dictate conditions to it—is just what the social-fascists wanted.

There is no doubt whatever that the ridiculous appeal of the Brandlerites is part of the present general crusade against the U.S.S.R. In order to carry out their social-fascist instructions with the necessary tact, and to show that their testimony as to the fatal illness of the Comintern comes from competent people, communists whose hearts ache out of compassion for the Comintern, the Brandlerite renegades chose a suitable pretext for their benevolent interference in the internal affairs of the Comintern. They used for this pretext the resolution of March 21st of the C.C. of the C.P.G. which demands that besides a fight against the right danger, as the main danger, a ruthless struggle has to be conducted against left sectarianism. By the example of this resolution, the Brandlerite renegades try to demonstrate how serious the illness of the poor Comintern has become and how timely is the opportunity to carry out a surgical operation—decapitation!

This resolution of the C.C. of the C.P.G., according to the Brandlerites, signalises two

serious vices. Firstly, it signifies a "swing-round" which is merely the apelike imitation of the "swing-round" made by the C.P.S.U., as shown in Stalin's article directed against left exaggerations, *Giddy From Success*. Secondly, both the German revolution and Stalin's article constitute a retreat from the "ultra-left" course, but a belated and inconsistent retreat, and therefore incapable of stopping the Comintern from slipping into the abyss, but, on the contrary, only capable of accelerating its final plunge.

The Brandlerite renegades, who would be only too pleased to push the Comintern into the abyss—if only they were strong enough—are thus posing as tutors who would faint teach the Comintern its A B C. At the same time, however, they are unable to conceal the long social-democratic ears which protrude from their communistic masks. Only a 100 per cent. social-democrat could speak of the resolution mentioned above as being an "ape-like imitation of the Russian C.C. by the German C.C.," only a 100 per cent. social-democrat could fail to understand this simple proposition: in spite of the varying conditions of struggle of the Russian workers on the one hand, and the workers of capitalist countries on the other, these two detachments between them constitute the closely united front of the world proletarian revolution which is opposed by the united front of the world bourgeoisie. For that reason the tendency of vacillations on these two sections coincide, although the nature of these vacillations is different and expressed in a retreat from the Party line—on the one hand in regard to one or another section of the peasantry, and on the other hand in regard to the social-democrats and reformist trade unions. That is the first point. Secondly, only a 100 per cent. social-democrat could fail to understand that in the present instance, neither in the C.P.G. nor in the C.P.S.U. can there be any question of a "retreat." The fight of the communists against "left exaggerations" is not a retreat towards right opportunism, but, on the contrary, is necessary for a *successful struggle against this right opportunism*. But we do not intend entering into a discussion on tactics with the Brandlerite gentlemen: one cannot discuss with renegades.

The message of the Brandlerites only interests us from one point of view. By this message they complete their path to open counter-revolution. Let us take a final glance back at the whole path transversed by Mr. Brandler. It is now clearer than ever how long-sighted the Comintern was in its unceasing fight, since 1923, against Brandlerism, and how timely it was in expelling him from its ranks.

Brandler started his career in the ranks of German social-democracy as an adherent of Rosa Luxemburg. Brandler, who came from the stonemasons' "Guild," which was saturated with craft prejudices, was, however, as little like the fiery revolutionist Rosa Luxemburg as chalk is like cheese. He assimilated from Rosa Luxemburg only her weaknesses (failure to understand the rôle of the Party, the significance of proletarian leadership and the organisational tasks of the revolution, etc.). Her strong side, her reliance on the creative force of the masses, ever remained a sealed book to him. He never understood the significance of this elemental force, and his attitude towards spontaneous revolutionary mass feeling was always one of political cowardice. His 'left-radicalism, as contrasted with the left-radicalism of Rosa, was dry, stereotyped and bureaucratic. Therefore, even at his best period he was inclined to replace the factor of mass revolutionary creative force by creative efforts of a bureaucratic nature.

Swept up by the common tide of revolution, he took part in the Chemnitz rising and also in the March events. Having burned his fingers at this, he never sinned again in that way. When, after the March action, the Comintern expressed opposition to the so-called "theory of attack," and criticised the March action as being erroneous, the sobered Brandler interpreted this as being a renunciation of attacks altogether, and he launched the slogan: "Never attack again." When after the March days Brandler came up for trial he immortalised himself, one might say, by his statement in the Court: "We communists by no means rely only on insurrection; in Germany, under certain conditions, we could establish the dictatorship of the proletariat on the basis of paragraph 48 of the Weimar con-

stitution." Paragraph 48 of the Weimar constitution as the path to proletarian dictatorship! What legalistic, constitutionalist idiocy must have possessed him to make him stoop to such absurdity! That remarkable pronouncement provides the key to understanding Brandlerism in its entirety.

In 1921, also, Brandler reckoned on being able to bring about the revolution by a bureaucratic method. Entering into a coalition with the "left" social-democrat Zeigner in Saxony, he strictly observed the constitution. On the one hand he occupied the post of secretary in order to be better able to obtain arms by legal means, while on the other hand, he dissolved the Chemnitz Factory Committee Congress and gave the signal for the retreat of the Hamburg insurrectionaries. He considered that the arms accumulated in consequence of the powers given him by the constitution, could assure the success of the revolution without developing the revolutionary movement of the masses. On the eve of entering the coalition, he stated in the Comintern "Power in Germany is lying in the streets, and it only needs picking up." When, as was to be expected, it was found that power by no means lay in the streets, but that a desperate struggle would have to be conducted for this power and that for the struggle it was necessary to *mobilise the masses*, he capitulated without fighting. Brandler's bureaucratic stupidity and his political distrust of the elemental force of the masses, lead to his complete capitulation in 1923.

Thereby ended the first stage of his active, leading political work. When, however, he was removed from the leadership of the C.P.G. he used his leisure time, along with the learned academician Thalheimer (kindred if not in trade, at least in Philistine professional spirit) in order to work out the famous theoretical platform of Brandlerism. This theory, which was a generalisation of the ill-fated "Saxon Experience," was a complete theory of the peaceful growth of Socialism, concealed by communistic phraseology. (Control over production and a workers' and peasants' government without an armed proletariat, without disarming the bourgeoisie and without Soviets.) When subsequently he once more tried to return from theory to

practice and by means of fractional machinations tried to restore an opportunist leadership, he was expelled from the C.P.G. Such is the history of his renegacy. He left the Comintern with the testimonial of an opportunist and political coward who feared most of all the development of the revolutionary mass struggle.

How has it come about, then, that Brandler, Thalheimer and Roy have now begun to talk so courageously and so impudently in their appeal to the Comintern? It is explained by the fact that the Brandlerites are no longer the cowardly opportunists underestimating the strength of the working class. They have long outgrown that stage. Following the logical course of renegades, they now belong to another class. They have gone over to the class enemies of the proletariat and it is from this new source that they derive their present courage. Formerly, the Brandlerite demands for the establishment of a united front with the social-democratic and trade union bureaucracy, and their endless reiteration that the German workers, with their old, strongly built organisations and deep-rooted habits, would not and could not follow the path of "Russia's spontaneous revolutions," were a cover for their lack of confidence in the possibility of a revolutionary assault vanquishing the enemy. These theories are now a cover for their anxiety to establish a united front with the social-democratic Party *against the revolution*. This is quite clearly shown in the recent open letter of the Brandlerites and in all their recent activities.

In their "open letter," the Brandlerites jeeringly refer to the "contradictions of the third period," and to "the talk about a rising revolutionary tide." All they can see is the successful attack of the capitalists along the whole line. That point shows nothing new in regard to the Brandlerites. They had already made that estimation of the situation on the eve of their expulsion from the Comintern and it accorded with their capitulatory theory. According to them a revolutionary situation is characterised by "power lying in the streets" which "only needs picking up with the hand." According to them you can get power by a coalition with "left" social-democrats, by carrying out transitional slogans

and by peaceful evolution to socialism. For them the victory of the revolution does not require the development of mass action, or the leadership of this action, or the organisation of the revolution. Since that is their attitude, they naturally do not find it worth while paying attention to such trivial matters as the fact that in some places a strike movement is spreading, in other places demonstrations are held, accompanied by fights with the police, that in yet other places there is fraternisation with the soldiers and that in the colonies armed risings are here and there breaking out. All these facts are ignored, for they do not coincide with the strategic plan of the Brandlerites' capitulatory theory. What is new on their part is that they now not only underestimate this rising of the revolutionary wave, but they conduct an active fight, shoulder to shoulder, with the social-fascists against it. What is new is that, following the logical course of renegades, they are now coming out into the open as an *active counter-revolutionary force*.

Their recent move against the Comintern at a moment when intervention is being prepared against the U.S.S.R., is an open counter-revolutionary act carried out at the behest of the social-fascists. Their description of Comintern policy in their open letter is also counter-revolutionary. The only thing that distinguishes them from the bourgeoisie who are preparing to wage war on the U.S.S.R. and to smash the Communist Parties, is their impracticable, opportunist stupidity. The bourgeoisie fear the Comintern more than anything on earth. They know very well that the masses are seething with revolutionary ferment and that the only force that can and will unite and direct this ferment is the Comintern and its sections. Therefore, every time the Comintern undertakes some revolutionary activity, such as the August 1st or March 6th action, the bourgeoisie mobilise all its forces in opposition.

The Brandlerites try to show that the Comintern sections have lost all significance and almost ceased to exist. The main question—the *political influence* of the Comintern sections over the world masses and their connection with the mass struggle—does not interest them. In order to prove the complete declin-

of the Comintern forces, they select false figures on the numerical strength of the Communist Parties and revolutionary T.U. organisations and compare them with the strength of the social-democratic parties and reformist trade unions. At the same time they remain silent as to the innumerable instances in recent years when the communists have led strikes, demonstrations and unemployed marches in Europe and the U.S.A., and risings and partisan wars in the colonies. They are silent because, from their point of view, these are all trivial matters which do not deserve attention. What is more, from their point of view, all these events must be debited against the Communist Parties, for they constitute "putschism." In summing up the situation they declare triumphantly, "The Comintern has disappeared from the scene"!

Having booked a special order from the social-fascists, the Brandlerites are executing it with the greatest zeal. Therefore, if they paint a picture to suit these circumstances, one can hardly blame them! Their present inspirers, the social-fascists, will willingly forgive them, for the aim pursued by the Brandlerites by means of a stupid and base distortion of the facts, coincides with the aim of the social-fascists. By means of faked figures and distorted facts they say to the working masses: "Abandon the revolutionary front! Desert the communist banner, for the cause of the Comintern is lost!" By the same means they say to the bourgeoisie: "March more boldly against the U.S.S.R., no one will defend the Soviet Republic!" Their real meaning is not in the least diminished by the fact that in publishing the forged figures and distorted data they hypocritically add: "We also are pro-Soviet, we also are for the proletarian revolution." That they should add provisos of this kind is just what the bourgeoisie wants. They have to make these provisos in order to masquerade before the workers as competent witnesses on communist matters.

"Dead bodies roll quickly"—and the Brandlerites have rolled a long way indeed since they took to the path of renegacy. At the start, the Brandlerites strongly objected to our calling the social-democrats "social-fascists." That was in full accord with their

proposition that the path to victory lay through a repetition of the "Saxon Experience," through a coalition with the left social-democrats, through evolution to socialism by means of "transition slogans" put into practice. They did not deny that the leadership of the Social-Democratic Party was counter-revolutionary. At that time their motive for refusing to call the social-democrats *social-fascists* was that Noske had already shot workers and that in 1918-1922 we, nevertheless, did not call the social-democrats *social-fascists*. "Since then," said the Brandlerites, "nothing has changed; the social-democratic leaders have remained counter-revolutionaries and therefore there are no grounds for changing the tactics towards them and intensifying the fight against them." That old position of the Brandlerites is a stage they have outlived. They no longer speak of the reformist policy being counter-revolutionary, but of its being "inadequate." They call the social-democrats their "colleagues." Verbally, they interpret the united front as being "temporary alliances and compromises with social-democracy." Actually they are in *permanent alliance* with it.

At the factory-council elections they put forward joint lists with the social-democrats against the Communists and are now persuading the bourgeois parties to preserve the coalition with social-democracy. At the municipal elections they are persuading the workers to get a "workers' red majority," i.e., a majority of social-democrats and Brandlerites. Continuing hypocritically to style themselves a "communist tendency," they maintain a permanent united front with those whom two years ago they considered counter-revolutionaries—and conduct a ruthless struggle against the real communists!

At first the Brandlerites sharply opposed the new course of the Comintern and R.I.L.U. in trade union policy. The motive they gave was that this new course for an independent leadership of economic struggles, in opposition to the trade union fakirs, would lead to isolating the Communist Parties from the trade union masses, and diminish their influence over the organised T.U. membership. At first they advocated the slogan: "Urge the trade union fakirs to action!" But that

also is a stage they have long since outlived. At the time of the Ruhr lockout, together with the trade union fakirs, they undermined the fight. Blacklegging has become a system of theirs, and they also directly incite the authorities to attack the communists and revolutionary workers. They have become *open counter-revolutionaries*.

The Brandlerites have now completed their circle. They differ from the "left" social-democrats merely in that, while maintaining a united front with the social-fascists, they preserve their organisational autonomy and call themselves a "communist tendency." This "autonomy" of theirs is, however, only needed so that they can better carry out the special orders of the bourgeoisie. Their task, as renegades from communism, as distinct from "left" social-fascists, consists not only of holding back left-wing workers from joining the communists, but also of causing as much dislocation as possible inside the Comintern, and keeping in touch with the concealed Brandlerites—those practical opportunists who still remain in the Comintern. The Brandlerites have completed their journey and have now become unattached social-democrats with a false communist label.

We are living in the period of a rising revolutionary wave on the one hand and a fierce attack of the bourgeoisie on the revolutionary workers, together with feverish preparations for anti-Soviet intervention, on the other. The moment of final and decisive struggles is rapidly approaching. In such a situation, anyone who breaks with the communists must inevitably take up *an open stand on the other side of the barricades*. By their latest move, the Brandlerites have shown that they have already openly joined the united counter-revolutionary front.

The Comintern displayed great far-sightedness, which has now become fully justified, when it expelled the Brandlerites who had not at that time completely identified themselves with the counter-revolutionaries. The Comintern was guided by what Lenin wrote as far back as 1920 in his article *False Speeches About Freedom*, as applied to the Italian reformists. He wrote: "Everybody can see and realise that a revolutionary crisis is maturing on a nation-wide scale . . . Now

what is most necessary, what is absolutely essential for the victory of the revolution in Italy is that a party completely communist makes itself the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat in Italy, and that such a party be one that is incapable of vacillating or displaying weakness at a decisive moment. . . . We have to win a fight that is extremely difficult, onerous and carries great sacrifices with it, we have to defend the power we have won in the face of a situation of incredibly accentuated assaults, intrigues, slanders, scandal, incitement and violence on the part of the bourgeoisie of the whole world. . . . At such a moment, in such a situation, the Party must be a hundredfold more firm, more determined, more courageous, more devoted and more ruthless than in ordinary, less difficult times. At such a moment, in such a situation the Party must become a hundred times *stronger*, and

not weakened, if Mensheviks, such as those meeting at the Reggio Emilia Congress on October 11, 1920, leave it . . . ”

We now see how correct Lenin was, and that the Comintern was right when it followed Lenin's advice in its action in regard to the Brandlerites. The moment of decisive fights has not yet arrived, but the Brandlerites, at one with the social-fascists, are already participating in practice in the crusade against the Soviet Republic and the Communist International.

When the German proletariat comes into power, it will present a bill to the Brandlerites, along with the social-fascists, for their treachery, for their strike-breaking, for their provocative work in the Comintern, for their anti-Soviet work and for their faithful service to the bourgeoisie.

The “League for Liberation of the Ukraine”

By N. SKRYPNIK.

IN their endeavour to poison the minds of the working masses, one of the latest stunts of the enemies of the U.S.S.R. has been to raise howls about the trial of the “League for the Liberation of the Ukraine” now taking place in Kharkov, the Ukrainian Soviet capital.

The bourgeois and social-fascist press of Poland, France, Germany and other countries refers to the trial with stereotyped and absolutely venomous epithets about “bolshevik dungeons,” “Chekist provocations,” “Vengeance on the flower of the Ukrainian intelligentsia” and so forth. These epithets are accompanied by protests against “secret reprisals” and demands for an “open trial.” But no sooner did the actual trial of the “League for the Liberation of the Ukraine” commence than all information about it immediately vanished from their columns. The bourgeois and social-fascist press is now hushing up the trial, and merely publishing scraps of falsified information.

Yet, in actual fact, it would be impossible to devise a more open hearing than that which has been assured for this trial. Day in and day out, for a whole month, the powerful Kharkov radio station broadcast from the Court hall all the speeches and statements of the accused in

this trial. The wicked bolsheviks allowed the widest freedom of speech to those in the dock, to the members of various Ukrainian bourgeois and socialist parties : social-democrats, socialist-federalists, national-democrats, fascists, etc., and sent their speeches to all corners of the earth. One would have thought the bourgeois press of all countries would have seized the opportunity to print in full the speeches of these heroes of the Ukrainian counter-revolution !

But something quite different has taken place. The bourgeois press has hushed up the Kharkov trial while the Polish radio-station has worked hard to create a jam, in order to prevent listeners from picking up the Kharkov waves, transmitting the speeches of the Ukrainian counter-revolutionaries. This is because the Kharkov trial turned out to be quite different from what the enemies of the U.S.S.R. expected. Instead of exposing the “horrors of bolshevism,” and testifying to its coming downfall, the trial portrayed the final defeat and dislocation of the Ukrainian counter-revolution, and bore witness to the tremendous reinforcement of the power and force of the Soviet Republic. Instead of the gospel of counter-revolutionary ideas, from the lips of every one of the forty-five accused, the

radio transmitted the belated announcements of their complete repentance, their complete recognition of the falsity of their aspirations, unconditional recognition of the achievements of the Soviet Republic in the field of politics, economics and culture. The old and experienced leaders of the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist movement and the young representatives of Ukrainian fascism, venerable academicians and professors, and ordinary teachers and writers, co-operators and doctors—one by one in the court, they condemned their own past activity. What is more, over the wireless they called upon all those who still hesitated or who had formerly followed them, to renounce their ruinous counter-revolutionary ways, and appealed to them to work for the Soviet Republic and help in its defence against capitalist intervention. And intervention is threatened before all by Poland, the very country on whose behalf, with whose aid and under whose instructions the "League for Liberation of the Ukraine" worked. That the Kharkov trial should be of this nature is the inevitable conclusion to the entire preceding history of the "L.L.U.," and the whole former history of the Ukrainian bourgeois-nationalist counter-revolution.

I.

THE ROOTS OF THE UKRAINIAN COUNTER-REVOLUTION.

Perhaps nowhere have the inner contradictions of the bourgeois-nationalist movement been so fully expressed as in the Ukraine during the years of the Revolution. In Tsarist Russia there was acute oppression and persecution of Ukrainian culture, Ukrainian literature and even the Ukrainian language. In those days the national demands of the various nationalist and socialist parties and organisations had certain revolutionary significance, and during the whole pre-revolutionary period were energetically supported and defended by the Bolshevik Party. The proletarian party, after the overthrow of Tsarism, defended still more energetically and decisively the demands of the Ukrainian people for national emancipation. But no sooner had the proletarian revolution set in motion millions of workers and toiling peasants, and presented four-square the basic economic problems of the class struggle, when all the Ukrainian bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties—socialists included

—immediately opposed the proletarian dictatorship and entered into armed struggle against the soviets. Confronted with the proletarian revolution, the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalist movement immediately lost its revolutionary features and went over to the side of counter-revolution. Throughout the many years of fierce and bloody civil war, the proletarian dictatorship was opposed by a united national front of all the Ukrainian bourgeois and petty bourgeois, national-democratic and socialist parties. The civil war in the Ukraine was a fierce war between the united revolutionary front of the workers, supported by the poor peasantry and leading the middle peasants, and the united counter-revolutionary nationalist front of all types and groupings of the bourgeoisie, petty-bourgeoisie, kulaks and Ukrainian land-owners.

The keenest weapon of the counter-revolution in this struggle was the kindling of race-differences and race-hatred, the most shameful anti-semitism, leading to terrible pogroms, and the attempts to represent the soviet régime in the Ukraine as an occupation by a nation foreign to the Ukrainian people and its cultural development. The falsity of all these charges of the Ukrainian bourgeoisie has been revealed by the whole trend of events. Led by the Leninist Communist Party, the Ukrainian workers have created and strengthened their own proletarian state, developing the new Soviet-Ukrainian culture of the toiling masses. Having created this state, the workers now lead the way in the great cultural advance of the Ukrainian toiling masses. And this unprecedented development of the new Ukrainian culture is infallibly bound up with the equally profound and widespread work in assuring free development and self-determination to the toiling masses of the Ukrainian national minorities. This development, moreover, is not accomplished by a juxtaposition and struggle of nationalities, but aims at friendly joint activities on the basis of internationalism.

• This widespread cultural and national construction of the Ukrainian S.S.R. undermined and broke down the influence of the Ukrainian nationalist bourgeois intelligentsia, rendered their struggle groundless, made the petty-bourgeois intellectuals (except, of course, the émigrés in the pay of the Polish, Czech and other

police) turn to peaceful work within the framework of the Soviet Republic, made them "recognise" and obey it. But that was only until the class interest of the Ukrainian kulaks—the main force of support and inspiration of the bourgeois intelligentsia—began to be loudly voiced. During the last years of the restoratory period, and in particular with the transition to the period of new construction, the class struggle in the villages became intensified. The extensive development of industry, the industrialisation of the country, and finally the technical and economic reconstruction of agriculture, has encountered the fierce resistance of the kulaks, who see that the proletariat definitely intend liquidating the kulaks as a class. The intransigent nationalist elements of the Ukrainian petty bourgeois intelligentsia are acting as the scouts and organisers in this struggle. Already in 1926, just before the country passed on to the period of new and planned construction of economy, the "League for Liberation of the Ukraine" was organised in Kiev.

II.

WHAT IS THE "LEAGUE FOR LIBERATION OF THE UKRAINE" ?

The organiser of the L.L.U. (League for the Liberation of the Ukraine) was the well-known writer and politician Efremov, member of the Ukrainian Academy of Science. At the end of the 'nineties Efremov was one of the most prominent leaders of the "Kiev Ukrainian League," an underground organisation which then united various Ukrainian groups which included revolutionaries and at the same time most moderate liberal landowners. In the 1905 revolution, Efremov was leader of the Radical, and later the Radical-Democratic Party, which was of a liberal and avowedly anti-socialist character. After the 1905 revolution was defeated, Efremov was the actual director of *Rada*, the only Ukrainian newspaper published in Tsarist Russia. Later he was the organiser and leader of the "Society of Ukrainian Progressives," an organisation of the Ukrainian big bourgeoisie, which sharply dissociated itself from all manifestations of the revolutionary struggle.

After the overthrow of the Tsar, Efremov renamed his organisation "The Socialist-Federalist" Party, became vice-president of the

Ukrainian bourgeois government centre, the "Ukrainian Central Rada." After the defeat of the Petlura nationalist government, he was the leading figure in the internal counter-revolutionary movement in the Ukraine. At the head of a counter-revolutionary organisation, the "Brotherhood of Ukrainian Rule," Efremov, in 1920-21 constituted a headquarters staff, providing instructions to numerous gangs of bandits. After banditism in the Ukraine had been stamped out, Efremov took advantage of the amnesty and started working in the Ukrainian Academy of Science, first as member, then as vice-president. In 1924 the Brotherhood of Ukrainian Rule became defunct. It became disintegrated, having lost the sympathy of wide strata of the Ukrainian bourgeois intelligentsia, who, by this time, had changed their attitude under the influence of the rapid restoration of the economic and cultural process. But two years later Efremov organised the L.L.U.

DIVISION OF LABOUR.

The "League for Liberation of the Ukraine" had two centres. The foreign centre united all sorts of representatives of the Ukrainian emigrés, and included the mutually hostile groups of the "Ukrainian People's Republic," the emigrant remnants of the former Petlura centre led by Lototsky, Chekalenko and others, and the outstanding representative of the Hetman's group, Doroshenko (former minister of the Hetman Skoropadsky in 1918). Residing in the various European capitals,—Warsaw, Prague, Berlin, Paris, members of the L.L.U. foreign centre linked the "League" directly up with the police, military and political authorities of the bourgeois states, receiving from them financial and material aid, instructions and orders for the L.L.U.

The "home" centre was headed by a narrow, closely-welded and highly conspiratorial group representing the former social-federalists and social-democrats: Efremov, Nikovsky—former Foreign Minister of the Petlura Government, the authoress Staritskaya-Chernyakhovskaya, Germaise, a social-democrat, Durdukovsky, a teacher, and head of the Pedagogical Society, ex-professor Chekovsky, former president of the Petlura Government and member of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian social-democrats and later leader of the Ukrainian Autocephalic

Orthodox Church, and other people. On the basis of Efremov's influence as vice-president of the Academy of Science, the L.L.U. had a footing in a whole number of scientific institutions affiliated to the academy, such as the Pedagogical Society, the Philological Institute, the National Library, Medical Society, etc.

At the same time, the L.L.U. organised a large number of local groups in many Ukrainian towns: Odessa, Kharkov, Dniepropetrovsk, Poltava, Chernigov, Vinnitsa. These groups were composed mainly of the old bourgeois Ukrainian intelligentsia. The ranks of the League included a fairly large number of professors and teachers in the various universities in Kiev and other towns, who conducted persistent though secret work in training counter-revolutionary cadres from among students of bourgeois and rich peasant origin.

Little by little, day in and day out, in a legal form, letting a subtle poison penetrate into all their work, these teacher-saboteurs influenced the young people's minds, fostered anti-semitism in them, trained them in national animosity and race-hatred. Their aim was to turn the schools into a means of national-fascist training, to prepare in them new young cadres of enemies of the soviet, who would throw all their youthful energy into rebellion and terror, murders and pogroms.

The counter-revolutionary youth forces were organised in a supplementary organisation, the "League of Ukrainian Youth" (L.U.Y.) the members of which were to be the mass agitators of the L.L.U. amongst the students and rich peasants. At the same time the L.U.Y. was the fighting group of the counter-revolutionary organisation. According to the evidence of Efremov and others, the L.U.Y. planned and prepared terrorist attempts on the lives of a number of Communist leaders.

The L.L.U., developing its activity throughout four or five years, extended its influence over several score of people, fifty of whom, having taken direct part in the leadership of counter-revolutionary organisations, were brought up for trial.

III.

THE PROGRAMME OF THE L.L.U.

From the statements of all the accused League members, it was clearly revealed at the trial that the organisation of the League was an attempt to

resuscitate the counter-revolutionary "united national front" against the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the forefront of their programme was the demand for an "independent" Ukrainian Democratic Republic. But, as all the members of the L.L.U. have declared, this demand was merely the camouflage, the verbal disguise, behind which were concealed the real class interests represented by the L.L.U. This nationalist phraseology was wholly and finally exposed at the trial, when a number of documents from 1920-1921 were read out showing that the Ukrainian nationalist "government" had concluded and proposed political and military treaties with all and sundry capitalist governments, and also with all groupings of counter-revolutionary forces. There was even a document showing that the Ukrainian nationalists were quite willing to enter into alliance and direct submission to Russian white-guard elements, who are the avowed enemies, not only of Ukrainian independence, but of the slightest vestiges of Ukrainian culture.

Finally, the evidence of the L.L.U. leaders showed that the whole "plan" for liberating the Ukraine was based on military intervention by Poland and Germany. This intervention was to be purchased by dividing the Ukraine into two spheres of influence: the right half of the Ukraine to be attached to the Polish State and the left half to be a dependency of German capitalism. The leaders of the L.L.U. were ready to sell into slavery the Ukrainian people; to subject the Ukraine to no matter whom and under any conditions; to portion out the Ukraine to the domination of Polish fascists and Russian tsarist generals—were ready for, and actually agreed to, all these things if only they could attain their chief object—the overthrow of the working-class power they hated so much, the dictatorship of the proletariat.

FIRST RESULT OF TRIAL.

The trial finally destroyed any petty-bourgeois illusions that the independence, or even the existence, of the Ukraine could be possible other than under the soviet régime, under the leadership of the proletariat. The vile, totally unfounded, false and corrupt nature of the nationalist slogans for the "independence" of the Ukraine outside of the Soviet system, and the exposure of this before the broad masses, was the

first important result of the Kharkov trial. The importance of this must on no account be underestimated. It was precisely by this exposure of the nationalist slogans and programme that the L.L.U. was shattered. It was precisely for this reason that the Polish radio-stations prevented listeners in Poland, Western Ukraine and Western White Russia from hearing the speeches of the Ukrainian counter-revolutionaries. Over the air the Ukrainian counter-revolutionaries by their speeches and statements exposed and renounced their slogans, carried out revolutionary propaganda in practice, opening the eyes of the West Ukrainian workers and peasants who are under the yoke of fascist Poland. An "independent" bourgeois Ukraine is only the pseudonym for the subjection of the Ukraine, for its transformation into a colony of fascist Poland, an object of colonial exploitation and oppression on the part of Poland and other capitalist countries.

The members of the L.L.U. knew very well and were compelled openly to admit that the nationalist slogans and demands for "independence," "self-determination," etc., were merely the means used by the League to create a united counter-revolutionary front in support of the real class interests of the Ukrainian bourgeoisie. The main object of the L.L.U., as it transpired at the court, was the restoration of the capitalist system and capitalist power. The main plank of the Ukrainian counter-revolutionary platform was the restitution of private property. The handing over of the factories and works to their former owners, the denationalisation of industry, the return of the banks to the former proprietors—these and similar items of their programme formed the basis for the bloc with the Russian and Polish landowners and capitalists, for joint counter-revolutionary action. The restoration of capitalist property was supplemented by the demand for the payment of all debts to foreign capitalists, and was the dominant note in the international policy of the Ukrainian counter-revolution. The grain and abundant natural wealth of the Ukraine have all the time been held out to the foreign capitalist as a prize worth trying for. Before the war a considerable part of Ukrainian industry belonged to foreign capital—Belgian, British, French and some German. The sugar industry was owned by Polish capitalists. The restoration of capitalist

property and the payment of debts was at the same time an aim which made the L.L.U. a weapon in the hands of international capitalism and the executor of its will.

BASED ON KULAKS.

The class-forces upon which the Ukrainian counter-revolution consciously endeavoured to base itself were the wealthy peasants, the kulaks. The class interests of the latter were fully reflected in the programme of the L.L.U. The agrarian programme of the League was expressed in two demands: the restoration of private property in land, and state guarantees for big farm property. It is interesting to note that the L.L.U. had two wings, who, in the main, were divided by this very question of the land. The "right" wing of the League was represented by the former socialist-federalists under Efremov. These representatives of the big landed and urban bourgeoisie put forward the demand for the formation of a state based on landed property of the big-estate type, i.e., farms of 50 dessiatins (100 hectares). The left wing of the L.L.U. put forward the demand for 30 dessiatins, expressing the interests of the basic mass of the Ukrainian wealthy peasants, the kulaks. This group was represented in the L.L.U. by the social-democrats.

Long before, in the days of the 1917-1919 revolution, the Ukrainian social-democrats had already put forward this demand. Even then they advocated at their congresses freedom of landed proprietorship for up to 30 dessiatins. In those days the Ukrainian social-democrats were a considerable party, and led the then Ukrainian "parliament," the Central Rada. Besides leading the government, the social-democratic ranks produced the most prominent counter-revolutionaries—Petlura, Vinnichenko, Chekovsky and the rest. Already in the years 1917-1919 the Ukrainian social-democrats, and the entire counter-revolution following them, tripped up over this programme for protecting the interests of the rich peasants. The broad masses of the middle peasantry turned away from the Ukrainian social-democrats and the counter-revolution, isolated them, and followed the proletariat. The Ukrainian social-democratic emigrants abroad, through their leaders, remained true to their programme of kulak land demands, and after being welcomed into the

camp of the Second International, defended at its congresses the "freedom and independence" of kulak Ukraine. The renewed energy of the kulak struggle against socialist construction once more summoned to political activity the live corpses of Ukrainian social-democracy, who revived in the L.L.U. their old-time kulak demands.

The representatives of the social-democratic foreign Central Committee during the trial attempted to declare in the press that they had no connection with the L.L.U., that they did not belong to its foreign centre, etc. The falsity of these statements was revealed by their own co-freres at the trial. (Incidentally, the Ukrainian social-democrats are not the only example of a purely rich-peasant anti-proletarian Party in the ranks of the Second International. The Latvian and Bulgarian brother-parties are of the same ilk.)

INTENDED FATE OF SOVIET FACTORIES.

It is interesting to observe how the huge process of industrialisation and reconstruction of agriculture being undertaken by the soviet régime has reflected on the programme of the Ukrainian counter-revolutionaries. In demanding the return of the nationalised factories to their former owners, the programme of the L.L.U. at the same time came up against the fact that scores and scores of new industrial enterprises had already grown up under the soviet régime. In response to this phenomenon two tendencies are to be observed among the Ukrainian counter-revolutionaries: the "left" Ukrainian social-democrats proposed preserving the newly-erected soviet factories as state enterprises, as a basis for the Ukrainian "national" industry. At the trial, these heroes of the Second International stated how they reckoned on the assistance of the State power to carry out the exploitation of the Ukrainian workers, demanding of them slavish subjection on behalf of the interests of "national" production. But as a matter of fact the social-democrat members of the League easily gave up these demands and adhered to the general line of the L.L.U.: the industry erected by the soviet régime was to be a payment to the international capitalists for their armed intervention.

To the soviet Five-Year Plan of industrialisation and agricultural reconstruction, the

Ukrainian counter-revolutionaries opposed their own plan. Purchasing "liberation" from the soviet régime at the price of political dependence upon international capitalism and fascist Poland, the Ukraine was to become a peasant country in which the wealthy peasants would be in power. Ukrainian industry would pass into the hands of foreign capitalists, and would be a means of extracting colonial surplus profits. The Ukraine was to be mainly an agrarian and not an industrial country. It was to be a market for selling Polish and German industrial commodities. (On this the counter-revolutionaries based their double dealings—simultaneously negotiating with Polish and German fascism.) The Kharkov trial finally exposed the entire plan of work of the Ukrainian counter-revolution. The Ukraine faces two paths: the path of counter-revolution—the kulak path, leading to the transformation of the Ukraine into a colony; or, on the other hand, the path of the proletarian revolution, of socialist construction and collectivisation. That choice has to be faced in actual life. That question was answered at the Kharkov trial, the L.L.U. was answered by the millions of toiling Ukrainian peasants who are developing the powerful movement of agricultural collectivisation.

IV.

THE METHOD OF PREPARING INTERVENTION.

All the hopes and expectations of the Ukrainian counter-revolution and its leading organisation the L.L.U. were placed in external forces, in the armed intervention of capitalist countries. The armed struggle of the Ukrainian counter-revolution against the Soviet power ended ten years ago. The home forces of the Ukrainian counter-revolution were then smashed in fierce open battle and since then all hopes and expectations, all calculations of the counter-revolutionaries have been based on foreign intervention, armed intervention on the part of the neighbouring imperialist countries—in particular, of Poland. In the Western Ukraine there are various groups—fascists and social-radicals (members of a party affiliated to the Second International), who speak as if they are relying on their own forces. But this phraseology is only meant to deceive the toiling masses. All the Western Ukrainian bourgeois and socialist parties and organisations in practice have

already become direct instruments in the hands of fascist Poland, an auxiliary force in the preparation of military intervention.

For a long time now the plan of the world-bourgeoisie has been to occupy the Soviet Ukraine by a military assault, to detach it from the Soviet Union and turn it into a base for a subsequent armed offensive on the Centre of the Soviet Union, on Moscow. The Ukrainian counter-revolutionaries fully accept, support and operate this plan. Moved by blind hate for the proletariat and its power, the Ukrainian counter-revolutionaries, dreaming only of the restoration of the independence of kulak big-farmers, not only support this plan, but take an active part in the preparatory work for carrying it out. It is in preparation for military intervention by Poland that the counter-revolutionaries have engaged in double-dealings in their international policy. The L.L.U. simultaneously conducted negotiations both with the representatives of the Polish government as also with prominent German fascist leaders. The programme and tactics of the Ukrainian counter-revolution were agreed upon and directed simultaneously by Marshal Pilsudsky and by General Gröner, leader of the German armed forces. The Ukrainian counter-revolutionaries received money and assistance from the military, police, diplomatic and other agents of both these powers which act so hostilely to one another in their foreign policy.

This double game of the L.L.U. not only aimed at picking up as much gold as possible from any source, but was also a finely calculated policy. By negotiating to cede the whole left half of the Ukraine as a colonial dependency to be exploited by Germany, the counter-revolutionaries reckoned they could purchase the neutrality or even the direct support of Germany to secure the lines of communication of the Polish army in the latter's attack on the U.S.S.R. The servility of the Ukrainian counter-revolution to the aims of the world capitalists is here revealed in all its nakedness.

"REALISTIC" POLICY OF GERMAN BOURGEOISIE.

On the other hand, the negotiations of the official German representatives with the agents and emissaries of the League for Liberation of the Ukraine are a real indication of the new orientation of the German bourgeoisie on the

"East European question." The foreign policy of the German fascists, and of the social-democrats who actively support them, is being reshaped. Aims conceived on the basis of the Versailles Treaty are being revised. The nationalist anger of the German bourgeoisie at the annexation of Upper Silesia and the Dantzig corridor by Poland is giving place to "realistic" hopes for Eastern expansion, for the capture of new markets in a Ukraine freed from the Soviet régime. The Dantzig "bridge" it is true, separates East Prussia from Germany, but by negotiating with the Ukrainian counter-revolutionaries they hoped to be able to erect a "viaduct" which would lead straight to the rich Ukrainian fields and new markets for the German bourgeoisie. The German military clique remember the 1918 days when the Ukraine was occupied by arrangement with the counter-revolutionary Ukrainian Central Rada. Now they dream of resuscitating the German-Ukrainian counter-revolutionary alliance. Foolish hopes; groundless calculations! The alliance of German and Ukrainian counter-revolutionaries would mean just the same betrayal of the interests of the German toiling masses as of the interests of the Ukrainian toiling masses. The "realpolitik" of German fascism and social-fascism will end in the same failure as the plans of the Ukrainian counter-revolution.

The internal policy of the L.L.U. was also subjected to the task of preparing for armed foreign intervention. The armed intervention and its preparation were the practical tasks to which the Ukrainian counter-revolutionaries directed all their efforts. They did not deceive themselves by any hopes that they would be able to inspire a rising of the broad masses of the toiling peasantry. They knew that the peasant poor and the basic mass of the middle peasantry had bound up their fate with the soviet system. Simple calculations confirmed this for them. The proletarian revolution gave the Ukrainian peasantry 14,000,000 hectares of land, confiscated from the landowners. According to the plans and programme of the Ukrainian counter-revolution, the peasants, after the overthrow of the soviet régime, were to pay the landowners for this land more than seven milliard roubles—as a minimum reckoning. The toiling masses of the Ukraine were also to be saddled with the

beneficent obligation of redeeming that part of the Tsarist government debts apportioned to the Ukraine, which, according to the calculations of Efremov, leader of the L.L.U., reached the substantial sum of more than five milliard roubles. The Ukrainian counter-revolutionaries therefore clearly realised that the broad masses of the peasantry would not follow them.

WORKERS SOLID FOR BOLSHEVIKS.

They reckoned still less on getting support from the workers. The evidence at the trial given by Professor Germaise, a Ukrainian social-democrat and member of the presidium of the counter-revolutionary organisation, was highly characteristic and informative. Already at the inception of this organisation and on the drawing up of its plan of work, the socialist-federalists brought up the question of the desirability of conducting propaganda among the workers. The social-democrat Germaise had then made a statement to the effect that the workers were "contaminated" with bolshevism, that they followed the Communist Party, and that social-democratic propaganda amongst them could not count on success. It transpired at the trial that this opinion was shared by the other social-democrat members of the L.L.U.—Chekhovsky, Slabchenko, Barbar, etc. The Second International, of which Ukrainian social-democracy is a component part, should remember that according to the admission of the Ukrainian social-democrats themselves, the Ukrainian workers are solid behind the bolsheviks, social-democracy has no influence among them, and the Ukrainian counter-revolution is opposed by the entire working-class.

The League for Liberation of the Ukraine fully realised that its plan for armed insurrection against the Soviet régime were supported by one force alone—the Ukrainian kulaks. Three hundred thousand kulaks out of a population of 30,000,000—such was the force that the counter-revolutionaries relied on to organise a "national" armed rebellion against the proletarian dictatorship. But they never envisaged that this armed rising could have any independent significance. According to the plans and calculations of the L.L.U., the purpose of this armed rising was for the provocation and support of foreign armed intervention. The leaders of the L.L.U. at the trial had to admit that their whole idea of the

rising was that the armed action, particularly in the regions bordering on the neighbouring power, should *serve as a pretext for intervention* by the neighbouring states. The trial of the L.L.U. reveals the plans of European imperialism in regard to the U.S.S.R., and perhaps the trend of events, which, according to the plans, was to have led to armed intervention. In accord with the Polish general staff, the counter-revolutionary organisation, at a definite moment, was to organise armed action and insurrection in the zone along the Polish frontier. The Polish Government, the League of Nations, etc., would be pelted with declarations (forged by the L.L.U.) "on behalf of the population," declarations of "the national will," etc., with the request for intervention, for the defence of the "masses of the people" from the horrors of bolshevism—and so forth. Benevolent fascist Poland, with the knowledge and sanction of the big powers, was to act as the noble defender of the Ukrainian people from the soviet power, and was to move troops into the Ukraine frontier districts that would be made ready by a counter-revolutionary rising.

The years 1930 or 1931 were the dates the counter-revolutionaries had in mind for the operation of their plans. The collapse of the Ukrainian counter-revolutionaries, and their final discrediting at the trial now taking place, has wrecked these plans and hopes of Polish imperialism. The world proletariat, however, should pay the utmost attention to the plans for organising and preparing armed intervention in the U.S.S.R., as exposed at the Kharkov trial. The plans for imperialist intervention are exposed. But though the calculations of the Ukrainian counter-revolutionaries are shattered, the inner mechanics of the imperialist schemes must be made known to the broad masses of the Western European proletariat.

V.

TACTICS OF THE UKRAINIAN COUNTER-REVOLUTION.

The mustering of the kulak forces in preparation for the rising was effected by the L.L.U. through the old Petlura cadres of the co-operative organisations. The Ukrainian co-operatives were for many years in the hands of the kulaks and constituted one of the main bases for the Petlura Nationalist movement. But with

the development of Lenin's "co-operative plan," the nationalist kulak elements lost their influence in the co-operatives. These elements were finally driven out of the co-operatives when the reconstruction period started, and with the widespread development of collectivised agriculture. Even now, various branches of the co-operative organisation are infested with kulak-Petlurian nationalist elements; they are still doing injurious work, but have lost all leading importance in the co-operatives, and therefore could be of little use for counter-revolutionary organisation. The main organised force, and what we might call the "mobilisation department" of the kulak forces was the specially created Ukrainian autocephalous orthodox church, led by the nationalist organisation. At the head of this autocephalous church was the former member of the Ukrainian social-democratic Central committee, Chekhovsky, while the head of the church hierarchy was the Metropolitan Lipkovsky (who incidentally also declared that he belonged to the Second International).

The Second International may pride itself that in the Ukraine its members and supporters are at the head of quite a considerable "idealistic" organisation, which after the manner of MacDonald combines Socialism with religion, religious preaching with counter-revolutionary organising. Information was produced at the trial, concerning the personnel of the leaders of this "church." The leading group was composed of former officers of the old Tsarist Army—46; former Denikin White guards—22; former members of various Ukrainian socialist parties—53; former Petlura bandits—214; former Tsarist gendarmes and policemen—17, and a good sprinkling of former members of the Black Hundred organisation—the so-called "Union of the Russian People." Such were the leading cadres of the "League for Liberating the Ukraine" 's mass agitational and fighting organisation—the Ukrainian autocephalous orthodox church.

It is not surprising, therefore, that when the Ukraine State Political Department (G.P.U.) discovered the vile schemes of the L.L.U. and this church's religious-seditious plans, the congregations of this church were bound to admit that the entire organisation was an instrument of counter-revolution, and an-

nounced their own voluntary dissolution and dispersal. These facts are a fine exposure of the crusade against the U.S.S.R. plotted by the Pope and other church leaders. Thus the wicked and fanatical soviet prevents the poor clergy of the Soviet Ukraine from organising armed rebellion! Religion, the "opium of the people," has acquired during the revolution a new importance as a direct camouflage for screening counter-revolutionary organisations and preparing counter-revolutionary armed rebellions. The Ukrainian autocephalous church was dissolved, however, not at the behest of the soviet authorities, but by the decision of its own council, who were frightened by the revelations, and who hoped, after liquidating the church hierarchy, to preserve the church itself as an administrant of religious chloroform to the peasant masses.

RESISTANCE OF THE YOUTH.

The work of the old and experienced bandits and Petlura officers through the counter-revolutionary church was to be supplemented by the organisation of the kulak and bourgeois youth—the L.U.Y. But the preparatory work of corruption carried on by the teacher-saboteurs among the youth encountered resistance in the actual schools, on the part of both the teachers and the pupils. Ten years ago, in the 1917-1920 period, a considerable section of the rural teachers were under the influence of Ukrainian nationalism. It was on the teachers and co-operators that Petlura placed so much reliance for developing his influence in the villages. But the experience of the past ten years, the wide extension of cultural and educational work during this period, and the building up of a new soviet Ukrainian culture, absolutely changed the attitude of the Ukrainian teachers. The L.L.U. was only able to recruit an insignificant group of supporters; the great majority of teachers turned away completely from the counter-revolutionaries. Indeed, in the conditions of the sharpened class struggle in the villages, the rural teacher is in the advance-guard, which is organising the carrying out of the widespread soviet economic and educational measures, collectivisation of the countryside, etc. It is not for nothing that the kulak terror in the villages is now directed not only against communists and active soviet workers from among the peasant poor, but also against school

teachers, fighters against illiteracy and educational workers. The Ukrainian counter-revolution could only count on a few score teachers and on schools whose directors were members of the L.L.U.—Durdukovsky in Kiev, Kholodny in Cheringov, etc.

But even in these schools secretly directed by the saboteurs, the nationalist work encountered resistance on the part of the pupils themselves. In the early days of the revolution, the enrolment of new pupils was entrusted to the schools themselves. For the schools they directed, members of the L.L.U. zealously selected the children of kulaks, nepmen, priests and the bourgeois-nationalist intelligentsia. Education should be and remain the privilege of the propertied classes—was the slogan earnestly and persistently voiced by the Ukrainian nationalists. When, however, the local soviets were able to devote more attention to the matter of schools and people's education, and the local soviet school commissions secured the school vacancies mainly for the children of workers, and poor people in general, nationalist propaganda in the schools met with a severe rebuff on the part of the youth organisations—the Young Communist League and the Communist Children's Movement.

SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC TEACHERS—FASCIST PUPILS.

At the trial, both the counter-revolutionary teachers and their apprentices—the young fascists—had to make a remarkable admission: the counter-revolutionary L.U.Y. was unable to enlist sympathy either among the students of the universities or of the secondary schools. The youth had become unshakably devoted to the soviet system and the young members of the rising generation were not adaptable to ideals and feelings hostile to the proletariat. The new school of the Soviet Republic is approaching nearer and nearer to what the programme of the Communist Party aims at, i.e., a Communist training and education of the broad masses. The counter-revolutionary organisation only succeeded in recruiting a few students' sons of kulaks or bourgeois. After going through their apprenticeship in school under the direction of L.L.U. members, the members of the L.U.Y. started working on the lines of fascism. The teachers were social-democrats and other varieties of "socialists"—their pupils were

intallibly fascists. This inevitable role of social-fascism in the field of education has been excellently disclosed by the Kharkov trial.

The League of Ukrainian Youth was to supply the counter-revolutionary organisation with young cadres of propagandists and agitators and direct executors of terrorist acts. (Incidentally as the L.L.U. included the writer of these lines in the list of Communist workers upon whom their terrorist blows were to fall, I do not consider it possible to enlarge on that aspect of their work.)

The members of the L.L.U. did not themselves directly perpetrate individual acts of terror. Their political task at the moment was to utilise the savage and malicious kulaks, who in their blind resistance to the socialist construction of agriculture, will, whenever they can, take savage vengeance on and even murder, individual Communists, active poor peasants, teachers and collective farmers. The fierce class struggle of the kulaks against the collectivisation of agriculture fully corresponds to the programme and tactics of the theoreticians of the kulak class, the "League for the Liberation of the Ukraine." The members of the L.L.U. themselves "did not succeed in killing anybody," as their leaders announced at the trial. But they had very far-reaching slogans which expressed ideologically the malignant hatred of the kulak class.

The leader of the L.L.U., that academician of banditism, Efremov, made a slight correction to his diary, which was read out at the trial. In the diary he wrote that after the victory of the counter-revolution it would be necessary to kill and cut-up two million Communists; in the court he made the correction: "only one million." Only one million! Workers of capitalist countries should bear these figures in mind. The "liberation of the Ukraine" by armed intervention is to present the peasants with a levy of seven milliard roubles for the benefit of the landowners, five milliard roubles contribution to the "Russian creditors" in France and Belgium and "only one million" deaths to the Ukrainian proletariat.

MURDER BY DOCTORS.

Is it surprising, then, that the bestial hatred of those petty-bourgeois of the L.L.U. who had doctors' degrees, made them resort to methods

of medical terror? The counter-revolutionary doctors had no need to worry about "medical ethics" in regard to sick workers or communists. They could poison them, commit intentionally fatal operations on them, etc. The counter-revolutionary members of the medical section of the Ukrainian Academy of Science spoke openly at the Kharkov trial about all these moral ideas of theirs. It seems that nowhere and at no other time have the "learned" enemies of the proletariat sunk to such low depths. But why are the Western European bourgeois and socialist newspapers silent about this? Why are the German, French, Polish and other medical societies not voicing their protests and indignation against the vile and depraved "ethics" of their Ukrainian counter-revolutionary colleagues? The bourgeois "friends of progress," the scientists and literateurs are too busy! They are busy obeying the summonses of the Pope, protesting against the persecution of the church in the U.S.S.R.—that poor church which the Soviet is preventing from preparing rebellion, from organising mass and individual shootings and poisonings! Only the workers will raise their voice against the murderous "morality" of the Ukrainian counter-revolutionaries. The poisonous ethics of the Ukrainian counter-revolutionaries is only a development of the attitude of the Austrian, German, French and other bourgeois states, which declare communists to be outside the law

VI.

THE MEASURES TAKEN AGAINST THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION.

The League for Liberation of the Ukraine is but one of many counter-revolutionary organisations, which throughout a number of years have carried on destructive activities in all the republics and regions of the U.S.S.R. Of recent years, since 1927, the State Political Department—organ of proletarian dictatorship—has unearthed a number of dangerous counter-revolutionary organisations composed of most highly-skilled old technical experts: engineers, agronomists, professors, etc., who have operated in various branches of industry, such as mining, transport and metallurgy. Marching under different flags, sometimes under the banner of mutually hostile nationalist organisations, but uniformly directing their malevolent hopes to the

single object of the overthrow of the soviet power; including people of widely varied views, from fascists to members of the Second International—all these organisations have conducted their work of sabotage under instructions and directions that have come from abroad, from financial centres of the world.

Finally, they are all distinguished by yet another common feature. The organisation for mining sabotage aimed at preparing, by accurately-planned technical destructive work, the breakdown of the coal output and the starting of a fuel crisis throughout industry—all timed to correspond with the armed intervention against the U.S.S.R., as calculated by their capitalist masters. The organisation for transport sabotage, timed for the same moment, its preparations for the breakdown of the entire railway and other transport system. Sabotage in various branches of technique and industry was to create a basis for the disorganisation of the military and economic forces of the U.S.S.R. This would be of the greatest service to the foreign armed intervention, would create a pre-requisite for such intervention, and was a component part of the entire plans for an armed attack on the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

What was the time limit set by the counter-revolutionaries? By what date did they expect to achieve the highest development and the greatest effect of their years of preparatory counter-revolutionary sabotage? For the mining industry the end of the period of preparatory work was fixed for 1930-31. The same dates were referred to by saboteurs in the transport organisation, the munitions industry organisation, the metallurgical organisation, etc. The same time limit was referred to at the Kharkov trial by members of the L.L.U., in connection with the preparations for an armed kulak rebellion in the Ukraine. It is obvious that 1930-31 was the objective aimed at, through varying channels and connected by different threads, under the most diverse and even contradictory banners, and through a variety of sabotage organisations—by the hostile forces directed against the U.S.S.R. from unified centres. The importance of the Kharkov trial is that it completes the picture of the preparations that were being made inside the U.S.S.R. to secure conditions for armed intervention from outside. The trial discloses the

inner mechanics of the transition from the stage of preparatory work to direct armed intervention.

INTERVENTION PLOT SMASHED.

But the cards of the internal counter-revolution have been trumped. The vigilant eye of the proletarian dictatorship has singled out the destructive forces operating in the various regions, and they have been destroyed. Thus have been undermined the conditions which, under orders from abroad, were being prepared to facilitate the attack on the U.S.S.R. by Poland and other countries at future dates planned by world capitalism. Likewise frustrated is the armed rebellion of kulaks in the Ukraine frontier zones, prepared through the L.L.U. for 1930-31, which was to have created a direct pretext for an armed offensive on the U.S.S.R. The hopes of world capitalism that they could render powerless the forces of the Soviet Union by the appointed time have been shattered. The military preparations of fascist Poland, mentioned in the latest news, find the Soviet Union forewarned and more prepared than ever. The hostile forces of the kulak class, and the counter-revolutionary organisations expressing them, will no doubt manifest themselves yet again, but the world capitalists' general plan to undermine and destroy the whole national economic life of the Union by timed military intervention has been scotched.

One question remains—how was this possible? How was it possible that the undermining counter-revolutionary sabotage, which had been carried on over a number of years, was detected and stamped out almost at one blow during recent times, instead of a long time prior to the completion of the plans? This is explained by the changed tempo in the economic life of the Soviet Union, the change to the planned reconstruction of national economy. All the counter-revolutionary sabotage organisations were formed and started their destructive work in the preceding period of economic development of the Soviet Union. They adapted the methods and tempo of their work to that period which we have now passed through. With the transition to the tasks of socialist economic construction, the endeavour of the saboteurs to

delay and undermine various enterprises in whole branches of economy has come sharply into contradiction with the lightning rapidity of economic construction during recent years. This was immediately felt, and in a number of instances made clear in the productive process by the workers, upon whose mass-initiative and class-consciousness the entire work of socialist economic construction is based.

The plans of sabotage conducted on a large scale by the counter-revolutionary organisations came into collision with the Five-Year Plan of socialist construction, devised and being carried out by the proletarian power. Whereas in the preceding period, the counter-revolutionary organisations had been able to veil and disguise their destructive plans, they were now submitted to a thorough test by the Five-Year Plan and were thereby discovered and exposed. The plan of world capitalism is opposed by the Socialist Five-Year Plan. The plan of socialist construction drawn up by the Communist Party and unswervingly operated by the Party has helped the Soviet proletariat to defeat, expose and overcome a widely-conceived and well-organised plan for the overthrow of the Soviet Republic.

In the light of these facts, how false and dishonest is the sound of Trotskyist and Right opportunist statements about the "impotence" of the Communist Five-Year Plan, its "instability," etc. It is still only the second year of the operation of this tremendous plan of socialist economic construction. Yet it not only fully justifies itself economically; not only has it further extended our industry and made the technical and economic reconstruction of agriculture a fact that is being actually realised, but it has created the conditions and forces for exposing and defeating the long-prepared and persistently-operated schemes for undermining our system and for preparing internal conditions for an armed assault on the Soviet Union. The armed attempts of the imperialist forces, the acts of sabotage of the internal counter-revolutionaries of all and sundry brands and tendencies must be answered by our further persistent, unswerving and self-sacrificing work to organise the proletarian masses, and to accomplish the Five-Year Plan for the socialist construction of our country.

6th March and Our Immediate Tasks in the Struggle for the Majority of the Working-Class

By B.V.

THE bourgeois and social fascist press have maintained a conspiracy of silence on the subject of the international day of struggle against unemployment—6th March. However, in political questions, as in all others, the tactics of the ostrich who, in face of unpleasant facts, hides his head in the sand, do not abolish those facts. Facts are stubborn things, and however bourgeois and social-fascist writers may keep silent about 6th March, 1930, that day will stand out in the international history of the working-class movement as a special chapter, indicating and emphasising the advance of the new revolutionary wave and the beginning of the change made by the working-class to new and higher forms of struggle.

6th March in all capitalist countries saw a mass movement of the unemployed accompanied by bitter fighting for the streets. The ruling classes took all possible measures to break the campaign for 6th March. The armed forces of the bourgeois states were held in readiness, the capitals were turned into armed camps, fortified with the latest military technique. Large factories were surrounded with police and armed cordons, and above them circled special police aeroplanes. At the same time the machinery of suppression was directed against the revolutionary organisations of the working-class, particularly the Communist Parties.

The social-fascists of all colours and shades, assisted by the renegades from the C.I., exerted all their strength to help the ruling class to crush the struggle. The Second International and the Amsterdam trade union international acted in full accordance with their role as the principal instrument of the bourgeoisie in carrying through capitalist rationalisation and the general attack on the working-class. In opposition to the revolutionary programme of the Communist International, the social-fascists came forward with suggestions for sacking the members of families where one worker was employed, and in their desire to serve the bourgeoisie they went as far as to take part actively in the arrangements for decreasing state unemployment benefits. Hence, on the 6th March (as on 1st August,

International Red Day) the C.I. was met by the united forces of the bourgeoisie, the state and the social-fascists, all mobilised for the purpose of crushing, at any cost, the campaign for 6th March. And on 6th March, as on 1st August, millions of workers answered the Communist call, demonstrating their growing revolutionary activity and the increasing influence of the C.I. over the masses.

AUGUST FIRST AND MARCH SIXTH.

The character of the demonstration of the proletariat on 6th March has important features distinguishing it from that of 1st August, 1929. The number of those taking part was greater on March 6th than on August 1st; but it must be remembered that this increase occurred in the United States, where thousands of workers took part in the Red Day demonstration, while more than a million workers rallied to 6th March. The great and stormy demonstration in the U.S.A. on 6th March, accompanied by spontaneous stoppages of work in such industrial centres as Detroit, are facts of great political significance, proving that the masses of the American proletariat are beginning to turn towards the Communist International. The most important task of the C.P. of the U.S.A. is to utilise to the utmost their changed attitude.

As far as the European capitalist countries are concerned, the number of those taking part was somewhat smaller than on 1st August; although there was this decrease in the size of the demonstration in the capitals, the number of workers in the provinces who demonstrated was on the whole larger, and took place in several districts where the Party organisation is very weak (Nancy and Moselle in France, Malmo in Sweden). To what can we attribute this decrease in the European countries, as compared with 1st August? In the first place, the preparations were very weak, as a result, in many cases, of a pessimistic and opportunist estimation of the situation by various leading workers in the Party and the revolutionary trade union movement. The Central Committees of all Communist Parties have admitted that they

began too late with the preparations for 6th March—only in the second half of February—and that the Party organisations, particularly the lower ones, the factory cells, were not mobilised as they should have been. The time for preparatory work was, therefore, considerably shorter than it was for 1st August. But even if preparations did begin only in the second half of February, that still gave us enough time to set Party organisations in motion. The excuse of insufficient time is therefore invalid, merely proving that our Parties have not yet learnt to work in a bolshevik and militant fashion. However, insufficient preparations remain a fact. We must also take into account the admission made by the C.C. of the C.P. of France, that, in connection with the 6th March campaign, leading workers in the French Party were of the opinion that such a campaign was not suitable for France, where there was no crisis and no mass unemployment. The C.C. of the C.P. of the U.S.A. in its turn declared that the extent of the movement in the U.S.A. on 6th March came as a complete surprise to the Party. This means that the Party was unaware of the attraction exercised by itself and of its consequences, the possibility of considerably strengthening the red trade union movement, of transforming the street demonstrations of 6th March into a broad struggle for partial economic demands, and the possibility of transforming this into a great strike movement. The Detroit District Committee pointed out that together with the local organisations in Detroit, it overlooked the militant readiness of the Ford workers and therefore, incorrectly, refrained from calling for a strike. But the workers themselves came out on strike and the Party organisation found itself dragging at the tail of events. Examples similar to that of Detroit occurred in other American towns and in other capitalist countries. These facts show that opportunism in practice is now, as before, the chief danger preventing the Communist Parties in capitalist countries from taking their place in the vanguard of the developing class struggle of the proletariat and from leading the working-class to new attacks and victories. These facts also show that if the Communist Parties of the United States and of western Europe had appealed more boldly and energetically for revolutionary demonstrations on 6th March, the picture presented by the

international day of struggle against unemployment would have been quite different, for the movement would then have included greater numbers of the proletariat and that alone would inevitably have changed the character of the street demonstrations and the extent of the strike movement.

GREATEST DEFECT OF MARCH SIXTH CAMPAIGN.

On 6th March there was a strike movement only in France and Spain. In other capitalist countries the Communist Parties, with the consent of the International, did not call for strike action. This was correct. However, even if 6th March was not to be a day of mass political strikes, the slogan of political strikes, as a propagandist slogan uniting the 6th March campaign with the immediate objectives of the future development of the working-class struggle should have run through all our preparatory work. The Communist Parties did not link up the objectives of the campaign of struggle against unemployment with the task of preparing for mass political strikes. This was the greatest defect in the whole campaign for 6th March, and was an inevitable consequence of the attitude expressed in the words "dragging at the tail of events," of scepticism about the radicalisation of the proletariat, lack of confidence in their own strength, and in the capacity of the Party to assume the leadership in the greatest revolutionary movements of the international proletariat.

The 1st May will afford an opportunity for a re-trial of the Parties in regard to mass political strikes. This examination will be passed by the Parties successfully, to the extent that they benefit from the experiences of 6th March, which means, principally, to the extent that the Parties exert all their strength in the ideological and organisational fight against opportunism in their own ranks.

May Day will also be a test for the Communist Parties—as to how far they can take the leadership of the mass proletarian movement against the danger of a new imperialist war and particularly against the danger of armed imperialist attack on the U.S.S.R. The 6th March campaign was a campaign of struggle against unemployment and the effects of capitalist rationalisation, but in the preparations for that day it was impossible to ignore the glaring

fact of the rapidly growing danger of armed imperialist attack on the Soviet Union. This point was discussed and emphasised at the conference of European Communist Parties which decided to conduct the 6th March campaign. In fact, however, the campaign was only weakly linked up with preparations for struggle against the danger of imperialist war.

WEAK WORK IN THE FORCES.

This was particularly clear in the weakness of our work among soldiers and sailors. The material available gives only one instance of soldiers having taken part in the demonstration (in Czecho-Slovakia); probably there were other instances, but there was certainly no mass participation of soldiers and sailors in the workers' demonstrations of 6th March. It will be possible to change this state of affairs only by increased work in the army, and particularly by all Party organisations undertaking an intensive anti-war campaign, adding to the workers' demands the demands of the soldiers and sailors and uniting them with the general class demands of the proletariat and with the struggle for a workers' and peasants' government for the proletarian dictatorship.

The 6th March campaign shows that if the Parties succeed in overcoming opportunism and irresolution in their own ranks, they will be able to organise and to lead great revolutionary movements of the proletariat. A considerable increase in the militant activity of the workers was apparent in all the demonstrations; during the course of the campaign new forms of demonstration and strike activity were developed.

In the fight against the police forces mobilised by the ruling class with the object of preventing and dispersing proletarian demonstrations on 6th March, the working-class in many countries developed special methods of organising demonstrations, which will undoubtedly be greatly extended in the future. Hitherto demonstrations have been arranged by calling upon the workers generally to come out on a certain day and meet at a certain place. By this method, only casual people came to the appointed place, as a rule unknown to each other, having nothing in common, and consequently the demonstration was weak and internally unorganised, while

the police were able to send their *agents provocateurs* into the crowd with impunity. Moreover, by this method of calling the demonstrators to the principal square of the town, the police were always able to occupy the square beforehand and to bar the way, so that the demonstrators had not even the chance of assembling. On March 6th, however, in several countries, the basis for organising the demonstration was the factory (employed and unemployed workers connected in one way or another with a particular factory). These factory contingents were organised beforehand by the factory committee of action (leaders appointed, a defence force organised, the route mapped out in consultation with the central leadership of the demonstration, etc.).

ADVANTAGES OF NEW FORMS.

This form of organising demonstrations offers several great advantages: each factory contingent was a more or less compactly organised group, into which it was difficult for police agents to penetrate and which possessed much greater fighting and manoeuvring ability; secondly, factory contingents increase the number of demonstrations and divert the attention of the police to several different places and thus disorganise their plan; each factory contingent can display the revolutionary slogans of the Party in its particular area, rallying the proletarian population of their districts, drawing them into their own ranks and marching together to the central meeting points of the demonstration. This new form of demonstration was utilised most successfully in Berlin, where, particularly in the working-class districts, the Party was for hours the real master of the streets. In Paris, where the new form was also operated, the leaders of some contingents did not know where and how to meet each other, and at those points the demonstration was disorganised.

In all countries, the organisation and activity of a workers' defence force was unsatisfactory. The forces themselves were wholly inadequate and those which did take part in the demonstration were badly prepared. In most countries where there were big demonstrations, they encountered the resistance of the police. As a rule the resistance offered by the workers was of a spontaneous character. How much stronger this resistance would have been had it been organised and directed by a strong and numerous

defence force ! The working-class has brought forward thousands of proletarians prepared to maintain in action the right of the proletariat to the streets. The Party must organise this growing militant readiness by means of workers' factory defence forces. The collisions of workers and police on 6th March (as on May Day and 7th August last year) exposed the unpreparedness of the workers, who used the most primitive weapons of defence (fists, sticks and stones). A workers' defence force should make good this deficiency and become the real defender of demonstrations. The experiences of 6th March show that a workers' defence force will best be able to play its part if it does not mingle in the general mass of demonstrations but defends them from the side and rear. In the working-class suburbs of Berlin barricades were used very successfully to hold up the action of police vans.

NEW STRIKE FORMS IN FRANCE.

The French proletariat displayed new forms of strike activity on 6th March, which were a direct answer to the policy of suppression which the ruling class is conducting in France with the aid of the socialist party. Even before 6th March, the French workers used the methods of calling out the safety men in the mines, the maintenance staff in big factories, etc., during a strike, or, in protest against capitalist rationalisation, ceased work for short periods several times a day. On 6th March the workers in certain departments of the Citroen and Renault factories came out on strike in the middle of the day and called out the workers in other departments. The factory police tried to stop them, in many cases unsuccessfully, and for some hours the workers were masters of the factory shops and departments. The mounted police who came to the assistance of the factory police found it difficult to enter the factory yard, the workers resisting their attacks on the gates for a long time. In some big concerns in Czechoslovakia (e.g., the Skoda works) the demonstration was prepared in departments of the factory. The initiative was taken by the workers in the more advanced departments, and these, together with the workers' defence force, persuaded the less advanced workers to down tools ; then, having secured the defence of the factory gates from police invasion, they organised themselves

in the factory for the further struggle (election of factory committees, adoption of immediate demands, etc.). In a number of concerns in the Paris region, 6th March was the turning point in the strike movement. At the meetings held to discuss the question of ceasing work on 6th March, committees of action were elected, on the initiative of the Communists, to put forward the workers' demands to the employers and the police, and to lead the struggle until the demands were granted.

These new forms of strike activity were not very widespread (there were not many strikes on 6th March), nor were the new forms of demonstration applied consistently throughout, but it is quite incontestable that in the future these new forms of strike activity and demonstration, to which the workers turned instinctively in the course of their struggle, will spread rapidly and extensively. At the moment it is necessary for all the Parties and revolutionary trade union organisations to study minutely the new forms of the workers' class struggle which were in evidence during the 6th March campaign. They show that the working-class movement is approaching the change to a higher plane ; the change must be accomplished as quickly as possible.

UNITED FRONT FROM BELOW.

The essential condition to ensure this change to new and higher methods of struggle in the working-class movement is the wide and vigorous application of the tactics of the united front from below. These tactics were applied feebly on 6th March, as is shown by the fact that in all countries the number of factory committees taking part in the preparations for 6th March was very small, while those that did take part were not always supported by the decisive sections of workers in their factories, and did not draw into the movement the revolutionary workers in the social democratic parties and reformist trade unions. Sixth March was an extremely favourable opportunity for striking a blow at social-fascism. The attitude of the social-fascists towards unemployment has made the workers everywhere indignant. The Communist Parties did not take full advantage of this opportunity, because they did not use the tactics of the united front from below.

The social democratic and reformist trade union leaders have become social-fascists, and this development is now involving the officials of the lower trade union organisations ; this has led the Parties to ignore the tactics of the united front from below (it is characteristic of right wing opportunist deviations to recognise, in practice, only the united front from above) and, lately, to reject those tactics on the pretext that there is no difference between the leaders and the rank and file membership of social-fascist organisations. These opinions are held even by responsible workers in the Communist Parties of France and Germany. The C.C. of the C.P. of Germany has already given a decisive answer to these opinions. The C.C. of the C.P. of France is still hesitating, and is mistaken in hesitating, for this topsy-turvy opportunism must be pitilessly rooted out. In the future the measure of the correctness of the Party line on the question of mobilising the proletariat must be the establishment of a network of factory committees of action based on united front tactics ; that is, including revolutionary workers in the Labour Party and the reformist trade unions. These committees, being united front committees, must also be committees of revolutionary action. The drawing in of labour party and trade union workers must be accomplished on the basis of a revolutionary programme of action directed against the leaders of social-fascism. Here our old acquaintance and most fundamental obstacle again comes to the forefront—opportunism and mistrust of the masses.

Fighting against opportunism, and yet avoiding "left" mistakes, the Communist Parties, with the help of united front tactics, will be able to work vigorously for the annihilation of social-fascism, thus preparing the ground for solving the central tactical task of the moment—that of raising the working-class movement to the level of mass political strikes.

The International Communist Press and March 6th

IN examining the campaign for the International Day of Fight against Unemployment (March 6th), conducted by the Communist Party, we must start by examining the condition of our Party press before the E.C.C.I. and R.I.L.U. had arrived at the decision concerning

March 6th. The following fact must be recognised : although the unemployment problem has for a long time been very acute, the army of workless having grown to enormous dimensions, no systematic, prolonged and gradually intensified campaign was conducted in the majority of Party papers. It is true that as far as quantity is concerned, Communist newspapers, particularly in Germany and America, devoted much space to the unemployment question, but the main problems were treated in a very unsystematic manner. The idea of the joint struggle of the unemployed and the employed workers was not sufficiently sharply brought out, and was not applied along with all the practical conclusions to be deduced therefrom, to all important topical questions. The Berlin *Rote Fahne*, as also the German provincial press, in an agitational respect treated brilliantly the most urgent current topics, particularly the police terror against unemployed demonstrations. *l'Humanité* ignored the unemployment question. The London *Daily Worker* dealt with the unemployed movement quite unsystematically and did not treat it as the key problem in the present-day economic and political struggles.

The March 6th campaign undoubtedly did cause a stir in all the papers. In dealing with the unemployed problem the field of vision widened, the *international* significance of unemployment began to be brought out, the organisational aspect of the March 6th campaign was given an agitational basis, the narrow parochial viewpoint which had often prevailed when examining problems of unemployment, now gave place to a broader outlook.

In this article it is our object briefly to describe the campaign conducted by the Party press of Germany, France, Great Britain and America. On our analysis we will distinguish between three phases of the campaign : (1) The campaign preceding March 6th, (2) the direct preparation (March 5th and 6th) and (3) the utilisation of the March 6th experience.

THE PREPARATION FOR MARCH 6TH.

During the first weeks of the campaign, no substantial change took place in the position of the press. Except for the publication of the Communist International manifesto and the treatment of everyday questions, the press still

bore no imprint of a campaign. It was only in the last two weeks that a real concentration on the unemployed movement or the preparation for March 6th was to be noted.

The conducting of the campaign must be estimated from the following aspects: (1) the linking up of current campaigns (March 6th, the anti-Soviet crusade, International Women's Day); (2) the line of campaign, the putting forward of basic viewpoints, the united front of employed and unemployed workers; (3) the movement in the factories; (4) the international character of the campaign; (5) methods of mass mobilisation with the aid of the press; (6) the elucidation of main problems (world economic crisis, legality and illegality, social-fascism); information on the U.S.S.R.

It is from those aspects that we shall examine the most important Party papers.

On the eve of the March 6th campaign, the Berlin *Rote Fahne*, in accord with the situation in Germany, gave a prominent place to problems of unemployment and during the final weeks intensified the campaign. For example, the *Rote Fahne* devoted big top-of-the-page articles to mass unemployment and the struggle on February 25th, February 26th, February 28th, March 2nd, March 4th and March 5th. The most important central problems were dealt with in leading articles—it is true only partially (a leader on March 2nd on the question of the joint struggle of employed and unemployed workers, on March 5th concerning the fight for the streets, etc.). The strength of these articles lay in their live agitational treatment and correct emphasis of the significance of the struggle for the streets and also of the united front of employed and unemployed workers.

The campaign in the *Rote Fahne*, however, when examined from the aspects outlined above, discloses quite a number of defects and weak points, which can in no way be justified by referring to the pressure from many other campaigns, lack of space or other technical factors.

The first substantial defect in the campaign was that on the eve of March 6th the idea of *the broad united front from below* was not sufficiently used for propaganda by the press. This defect was noted by the recent Plenum of the C.C., C.P.G., as applying to many Party organisations as a whole. It is true, the necessity for a united

front of employed and unemployed workers was constantly emphasised, but very little was said on the even of March 6th of the necessity also to bring *the social-democratic* workers into this united front. Directly prior to and following March 6th, a manifesto was printed in bold type appealing to the social-democratic workers to join in the protest against the bloody social-fascist terror, but that correct appeal was not properly linked up with references to the common interests of the workers in the struggle for work and wages, as the *material* basis for the united front from below.

The second important defect of the campaign was the fact that the *Rote Fahne*, while dealing excellently with the ideological rôle of the C.P. in the fight against unemployment, ignored its organisational rôle. Throughout the whole campaign there was not a single article about the rôle of the factory *cells*. The page devoted daily to factory life, did not bear any imprint of the factory movement and devoted still less space to the united front from below. In general one finds in the Communist press, too many dry instructions and too few live accounts as to how the definite campaign in the factories has actually been prepared and conducted.

The third defect was the inadequate utilisation of material on the U.S.S.R. The anti-Soviet campaign of the churches was not sufficiently linked up with questions of March 6th. Once (February 26th, but unfortunately, only once, information on socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. was given a prominent place—on the front page. The most important Inprecorr articles on the fight against unemployment in the U.S.S.R. appeared *after* March 6th. In general the utilisation of material on the tremendous successes of socialist construction is still quite inadequate, whereas the bourgeois press prints its false and sensational information about the U.S.S.R. on the first or second pages. The *Rote Fahne* has the bad habit of tucking away current news about the U.S.S.R. on the so-called third political page, where it does not sufficiently strike the eye. In that and certain other respects, we must point out the excellent way the campaign was conducted by the "Hamburger Volkszeitung."

With regard to illustrations (pictures, cartoons, etc.), this campaign was very weak.

From the ideological standpoint it should be observed that such an important organ as the *Rote Fahne* should have given more attention also to the theoretical questions arising in connection with mass unemployment.

As far as *l'Humanité* is concerned, this paper, in the final weeks, devoted leading and top articles to the March 6th campaign almost every day. The international nature of the campaign was very well brought out. A politically weak point in the campaign, at the time of the French governmental crisis, was that in dealing with this crisis, the questions of the unemployed movement were relegated to the background. *l'Humanité* paid more attention than *Rote Fahne* did to the particular categories of workers. It appealed to civil servants and soldiers to take part in the March 6th demonstrations. The weakest point of the campaign in *l'Humanité* was also the treatment of the movement in the factories. We only found one small article on how the March 6th campaign was prepared in the factories. The editorial did not supply such articles with the proper commentary, calling upon other factories to follow the example set.

Information on the U.S.S.R. in the pages of *l'Humanité* throughout the whole campaign was just as inadequate as formerly. The daily publication of two or three telegrams on the U.S.S.R. for the information of the French workers was totally inadequate in view of the frantic anti-Soviet campaign going on in the whole French bourgeois press. On March 5th *l'Humanité* devoted a whole page to the U.S.S.R. and the material on unemployment was very well arranged, but this material was quite out of date. The very important new material on this question, however, the fact of the considerable decrease of unemployment in the U.S.S.R., was not utilised. This was a serious omission! The *l'Humanité* leading articles in a succinct and intelligible manner expounded the main ideas of the campaign and correctly advocated the E.C.C.I. slogans. The paper was very weak however, in the way it dealt with the purely agitational treatment of the problems. Instead of making the paper an organising factor in the factory campaign, *l'Humanité* restricted itself to agitation and propaganda.

THE LONDON "DAILY WORKER."

As far as quantity is concerned the *Daily*

Worker contained a great deal of material on the question of unemployment and the March 6th campaign, but unfortunately, here quantity surpassed quality. Dull and boring treatment impaired or weakened even the best articles. The day-to-day slogans were monotonous and vapid. Such slogans as *Fight against Unemployment* across a whole page, were not capable of setting the masses going and mobilising them for the struggle. The biggest defect of the *Daily Worker* was that: the campaign was inadequately utilised to *expose and pillory the treacherous character of the Labour Government*. Throughout the whole campaign quotations from the promises made to the unemployed by MacDonald and the Labour Party, on the eve of their entering the government, should have been printed in big type. The latest unemployment figures should have been constantly made to shout out from the columns, to make a striking impression. They should have been accompanied by illustrations and diagrams, but there was nothing of the sort. A great deal of material was published on the U.S.S.R., some of which was useful, but specific material on unemployment was not utilised. There was no distinction between the various categories of workers.

The *Daily Worker*, New York, really did carry out the campaign excellently. For several weeks the front page was entirely devoted to this campaign with excellently arranged material. The paper used impassioned and moving language. Good impressionable illustrations were printed every day and the churches' anti-Soviet campaign was handled in a more outstanding manner than in the European Communist press. The paper published very striking material on the combined activity of the big trusts and the churches. It also paid the necessary attention to propagandist problems—the world economic crisis and the question of religion. Big fighting slogans were at the top of every page. In general, it may be said that while ignoring all other questions (including International Women's Day, March 8th), the paper concentrated undivided attention on March 6th. One must admit that whereas, on the one hand, the excellent conducting of the American *Daily Worker* campaign is a reflection of the intensity of the unemployed movement, on the other

hand, the paper itself, by its striking agitation, greatly furthered the tremendous success of March 6th in the U.S.A. and provided an example worthy of imitation by the European Communist press.

MARCH 6TH AND ITS UTILISATION.

It must be recorded that on March 5th and 6th the Communist press brought the campaign to culmination point, but considerably waned in the process of utilising the experience of the campaign, with the exception of the New York *Daily Worker*. Close examination of the issues for March 5th and March 6th reveal that the press saw the significance of March 6th mainly in the *actual fact of demonstrations* and not in the *fighting programme*, which laid its own special imprint on these demonstrations. In this respect, the *Rote Fahne* headings are typical. On March 5th a heading ran: "The streets must be free" and on March 6th: "The world offensive of the hunger army." On March 6th, in an issue which otherwise was excellently made up, there was not even any boldly printed treatment of the March 6th slogans, although we assume there would be a bigger print of the *Rote Fahne* on that day. The same can be said of the main March 6th slogan in *l'Humanité*: "There will be demonstrations in the factories and streets." Demonstrations, yes—but under what banner? It was essential to indicate this. This once again reflects the one-sided appreciation of the significance and tasks of March 6th by the Communist newspapers.

In regard to *utilisation of the experiences* of the campaign, the main defect is the absolute absence in the press of any critical survey of the campaign. In our view, besides noting the achievements of the March 6th campaign, which is a further step forward as compared with August 1st, the defects of the campaign should also have been quite impartially submitted to self-criticism.

In making use of the March 6th campaign, *Rote Fahne* restricts itself exclusively to describing the significance of the sanguinary social-fascist terror. On the other hand, the campaign was wound up prematurely, and not succeeded by a transition into the preparatory campaign for May 1st.

L'Humanité, while also omitting all criticism of the weak points of the campaign, emphasised

in excellent leading articles after March 6th, the *role of the Comintern* and the great international significance of the campaign.

The British *Daily Worker* after March 6th displayed an inadequate understanding of the *new factors* in the situation in England, as signalled by March 6th—the significance of social-fascist terror in relation to the demonstrators. The rôle of the Party in utilising the experiences of the campaign was not clearly brought out. Things were improved by the linking up of the campaign with subsequent campaigns (hunger march and First of May). In utilising the March 6th experience, the estimation of the various demonstrations by the press also deserves attention. *Rote Fahne* immediately understood the great importance of the powerful demonstrations in America, and, except for certain exaggerations, gave a correct appreciation of their significance.

L'Humanité and *Daily Worker* (London), however, although on that occasion well supplied with information, at first absolutely failed to realise the importance of the New York demonstration on March 6th. The *Daily Worker* devoted a small par to the New York demonstration. These errors were only rectified afterwards.

In summing up, we must say that the utilisation of the March 6th experiences by the entire Communist press was much feebler than the preparation for this campaign. This defect deserves special attention as it reflects one of the *typical* weaknesses of our press. What the last Plenum of the presidium of the E.C.C.I. said about the sections in general, is equally correct when applied to the Communist press: in all the work undertaken, agitation and propaganda outweighs the *organisation* of the struggle. This by no means signifies that in agitation and particularly in propaganda, special efforts are not required. However, the process of the March 6th campaign undoubtedly has shown that the rôle of the Bolshevik press as an organising factor in the movement must certainly be strengthened.

We have left untouched here a whole number of typical weaknesses and burning unsolved problems of the Communist Party press, since they can only be elucidated by a detailed analysis of the general condition of our press. This is to be the subject of a special article.